

Chapter 2: Planning Process

2 Documenting the Planning Process

Documentation of the planning process, including public involvement, is required to meet FEMA's DMA 2000 (44CFR§201.4(c)(1) and §201.6(c)(1)). This section includes a description of the planning process used to develop this plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how all of the involved agencies participated.

2.1.1 Description of the Planning Process

The Elmore County Wildland-Urban Interface Wildfire Mitigation Plan was developed through a collaborative process involving all of the organizations and agencies detailed in Section 1.0 of this document. The County's local coordinator contacted these organizations directly to invite their participation and schedule meetings of the planning committee. The planning process included 5 distinct phases which were in some cases sequential (step 1 then step 2) and in some cases intermixed (step 4 completed though out the process):

1. **Collection of Data** about the extent and periodicity of wildfires in and around Elmore County. This included an area encompassing Boise, Ada, Canyon, Owyhee, Twin Falls, Blaine, and Custer Counties to insure a robust dataset for making inferences about fires in Elmore County specifically; this included a wildfire extent and ignition profile.
2. **Field Observations and Estimations** about wildfire risks including fuels assessments, juxtaposition of structures and infrastructure to wildland fuels, access, and potential treatments by trained wildfire specialists.
3. **Mapping** of data relevant to wildfire control and treatments, structures, resource values, infrastructure, fire prone landscapes, and related data.
4. **Facilitation of Public Involvement** from the formation of the planning committee, to a public mail survey, news releases, public meetings, public review of draft documents, and acceptance of the final plan by the signatory representatives.
5. **Analysis and Drafting of the Report** to integrate the results of the planning process, providing ample review and integration of committee and public input, followed by acceptance of the final document.

Planning efforts were led by the Project Director, Dr. William E. Schlosser, of Northwest Management, Inc. Dr. Schlosser holds 4 degrees in natural resource management (A.S. geology; B.S. forest and range management; M.S. natural resource economic & finance; Ph.D. environmental science and regional planning). Mr. Wayne Forrey, AICP, is a planner with many years of local planning experience in Elmore County. Together, they led a team of resource professionals that included fire mitigation specialists, wildfire control specialists, resource management professionals, and hazard mitigation experts.

They were the point-people for team members to share data and information with during the plan's development. They and the planning team met with many residents of the county during the inspections of communities, infrastructure, and hazard abatement assessments. This methodology, when coupled with the other approaches in this process, worked adequately to integrate a wide spectrum of observations and interpretations about the project.

The planning philosophy employed in this project included the open and free sharing of information with interested parties. Information from federal and state agencies was integrated

into the database of knowledge used in this project. Meetings with the committee were held through out the planning process to facilitate a sharing of information between cooperators.

When the public meetings were held, many of the committee members were in attendance and shared their support and experiences with the planning process and their interpretations of the results.

2.2 Public Involvement

Public involvement in this plan was made a priority from the inception of the project. There were a number of ways that public involvement was sought and facilitated. In some cases this led to members of the public providing information and seeking an active role in protecting their own homes and businesses, while in other cases it led to the public becoming more aware of the process without becoming directly involved in the planning process.

2.2.1 News Releases

Under the auspices of the Elmore County Wildland-Urban Interface Wildfire Mitigation Planning Committee, news releases were submitted to area news papers and radio (there are no local television companies servicing this county).

2.2.1.1 Radio Messages

Public Service Announcements (PSAs) were broadcast on two major Boise area radio stations that provide service to Elmore County areas. These PSAs described the Elmore County fire planning process and invited the public to contact the Elmore County Commissioners for more information.

2.2.1.2 Newspaper Articles

Committee and public meeting announcements were published in the local newspapers ahead of each meeting. The following is an example of one of the newspaper announcements that ran in the local newspaper.

PUBLIC MEETINGS FOR ELMORE COUNTY WILDFIRE MITIGATION PLANNING

The ELMORE COUNTY WILDFIRE MITIGATION PLANNING TEAM will be conducting public meetings to provide information and accept comments on the plan. All residents of Elmore County are encouraged to attend to review the information and provide feedback.

The team has been working since April of this year on the plan. It covers all lands within Elmore County regardless of ownership or boundaries. It provides a hazard analysis, that based on many years of data shows where historically fires have occurred in addition to areas of high fire spread risk. It also identifies communities and concentrations of development or sub-divisions as well as those individual properties and dwelling scattered throughout the county. The plan identifies those areas that are most at risk from fire and will recommend mitigation efforts to reduce the problem.

The planning group has also met with city and rural fire departments within the county to identify boundaries and or jurisdictions (or lack of) as well as equipment or training needs.

There will be four public meetings, the first one will be held at the Stage Stop on the

west side of the County on Interstate 84 (September 15), the second at the American Legion Hall, Mountain Home (September 16), the third at the Pine Senior Citizens Center in Pine (September 17), and the fourth in Glenns Ferry at the Glenns Ferry Senior Citizens Center (September 18). Each meeting will begin at 6:30 p.m. and will conclude at 9:00 p.m.

Public involvement and citizen participation is critical to this process. Please attend one of the four meetings to become familiar with and provide input to the plan.

If there are any questions, please direct them to Wayne Forrey, Elmore County Fire Coordinator at 208-362-9345.

2.2.2 Public Mail Survey

In order to collect a broad base of perceptions about wildland fire and individual risk factors of homeowners in Elmore County, a mail survey was conducted. Using the cadastral database of landowners in Elmore County, homeowners from the Wildland-Urban Interface surrounding each community were identified. They were included in a database of names that integrated individuals living on parcels with a home, at least 3 acres of land, and a mailing address within Elmore County. This database created a list of 312 unique names to which was affixed a random number that contributed to the probability of being selected for the public mail survey. A total of 207 landowners meeting the above criteria were selected.

The public mail survey developed for this project has been used in the past by Northwest Management, Inc., during the execution of other WUI Wildfire Mitigation Plans. The survey used The Total Design Method (Dillman 1978) as a model to schedule the timing and content of letters sent to the selected recipients. Copies of each cover letter, mail survey, and communication are included in Appendix III.

The first in the series of mailing was sent August 8, 2003, and included a cover letter, a survey, and an offer of receiving a custom GIS map of the area of their selection in Elmore County if they would complete and return the survey. The free map incentive was tied into assisting their community and helping their interests by participating in this process. Each letter also informed residents about the planning process. A return self-addressed envelope was included in each packet. A postcard reminder was sent to the non-respondents on August 20, 2003, encouraging their response. A final mailing, with a revised cover letter pleading with them to participate, was sent to non-respondents on September 1, 2003.

Surveys were returned during the months of August, September, October, and early November. A total of 107 residents responded to the survey. Four surveys were returned as undeliverable, and four responded that they no longer live in the area. The effective response rate for this survey was 54%. Statistically, this response rate allows the interpretation of all of the response variables significantly at the 99% confidence level.

2.2.2.1 Survey Results

A summary of the survey's results will be presented here and then referred back to during the ensuing discussions on the need for various treatments, education, and other information.

All of the respondents have a home in Elmore County, and 83% consider this their primary residence. About 24% of the respondents were from the Mountain Home area, 21% were from the Hammett area, 22% from the Glenns Ferry, 10% from Featherville, 7% from Pine, 5% from Atlanta, 3% from King Hill, 5% from Prairie, and 1% from Oasis.

Virtually all of the respondents (99%) correctly identified that they have emergency telephone 911 services in their area.

Respondents were asked to identify if their home is protected by a fire district. Many of the county's residents have rural or city fire protection, with the exception of the homes in the areas of Tipanuk, Pine, Featherville, Dixie, Prairie, and Rocky Bar. Of the respondents, 68% indicated they were covered by a rural fire district, 32% believed they were not protected. Approximately 60% indicated they were in a protection district and were correct. Approximately 15% indicated they were not protected by either a rural or city district and were correct. These two groups account for 75% of the total respondents which correctly identified if they were protected by fire department. Approximately 17% of the respondents indicated they were not protected by a fire department when records indicated they are, with the remaining 8% of respondents indicating they have fire district protection, when records indicate they do not. It is important to note, that many of the households responding incorrectly to fire protection, specifically those who believe they are protected but are not, were from the Pine, Featherville, and Prairie communities.

Respondents were asked to indicate the type of roofing material covering the main structure of their home. Less than half of the respondents, 42% indicated their homes were covered with a composite material. About 39% indicated their home were covered with an aluminum roofing material. Roughly 16% of the respondents indicated they have a wooden roofing material such as shakes. The additional 2% of respondents had a variety of combustible and non-combustible materials indicated.

Residents were asked to evaluate the proximity of trees within certain distances of their homes. Often, the density of trees around a home is an indicator of increased fire risk. The results are presented in Table 2.1

Table 2.1 Survey responses indicating the proximity of trees to homes.

Number of Trees	Within 250 feet of your home	Within 75 feet of your home
None	5%	10%
Less than 10	25%	41%
Between 10 and 25	38%	36%
More than 25	32%	16%

Approximately 78% of those returning the survey indicated they have a lawn surrounding their home. Of these individual home sites, 98% indicated they keep this lawn green through the fire season.

The average driveway length of the respondents was approximately 1,000 feet long, from their main road to their parking area. Roughly 8% of the respondents had a driveway over ½ mile long, and a corresponding 14% had a driveway over ¼ of a mile long. Of these homes, roughly 60% have turnouts allowing two vehicles to pass each other in the case of emergency. Approximately 78% of all homeowners indicated they have an alternative escape route, with the remaining 22% indicating only one-way-in and one-way-out.

Nearly all respondents (94%) indicated they have some type of tools to use against a wildfire that threatens their home. Table 2.2 summarizes these responses.

Table 2.2. Percent of homes with indicated fire fighting tools in Elmore County.

94% – Hand tools (shovel, Pulaski, etc.)

34% – Portable water tank

17% – Stationery water tank

Table 2.2. Percent of homes with indicated fire fighting tools in Elmore County.

46% – Pond, lake, or stream water supply close

32% – Water pump and fire hose

44% – Equipment suitable for creating fire breaks (bulldozer, cat, skidder, etc.)

Roughly 37% of the respondents in Elmore County indicated they have someone in their household trained in wildland fire fighting. Approximately 19% indicated someone in the household had been trained in structural fire fighting. However, it is important to note that these questions did not specify a standard nor did it refer to how long ago the training was received.

A couple of questions in the survey related to on-going fire mitigation efforts households may be implementing. Respondents were asked if they conduct a periodic fuels reduction program near their home sites, such as grass or brush burning. Approximately 72% answered affirmative to this question, while 60% responded that livestock (cattle, horses, sheep) graze the grasses and forbs around their home sites.

Respondents were asked to complete a fuel hazard rating worksheet to assess their home's fire risk rating. An additional column titled "results" has been added to the table, showing the percent of respondents circling each rating (Table 2.3).

Circle the ratings in each category that best describes your home.

Table 2.3. Fuel Hazard Rating Worksheet		Rating	Results
Fuel Hazard	Small, light fuels (grasses, forbs, weeds, shrubs)	1	65%
	Medium size fuels (brush, large shrubs, small trees)	2	25%
	Heavy, large fuels (woodlands, timber, heavy brush)	3	10%
Slope Hazard	Mild slopes (0-5%)	1	66%
	Moderate slope (6-20%)	2	23%
	Steep Slopes (21-40%)	3	8%
	Extreme slopes (41% and greater)	4	3%
Structure Hazard	Noncombustible roof and noncombustible siding materials	1	29%
	Noncombustible roof and combustible siding material	3	45%
	Combustible roof and noncombustible siding material	7	11%
	Combustible roof and combustible siding materials	10	16%
Additional Factors	Rough topography that contains several steep canyons or ridges	+2	Average -1.2 pts
	Areas having history of higher than average fire occurrence	+3	
	Areas exposed to severe fire weather and strong winds	+4	
	Areas with existing fuel modifications or usable fire breaks	-3	
	Areas with local facilities (water systems, rural fire districts, dozers)	-3	

Calculating your risk

Values below are the average response value to each question.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 \text{Fuel hazard} & \underline{1.4} & \times \text{Slope Hazard } \underline{1.5} = \underline{2.2} \\
 \text{Structural hazard} & + & \underline{3.9} \\
 \text{Additional factors (+ or -)} & & \underline{-1.2} \\
 \text{Total Hazard Points} & = & \underline{4.9}
 \end{array}$$

Table 2.4. Percent of respondents in each risk category as determined by the survey respondents.

00% – Extreme Risk = 26 + points
02% – High Risk = 16–25 points
36% – Moderate Risk = 6–15 points
62% – Low Risk = 6 or less points

Maximum household rating form score was 16 points, as assessed by the homeowners.

Finally, respondents were asked “if offered in your area, would members of your household attend a free, or low cost, one-day training seminar designed to teach homeowners in the

wildland–urban interface how to improve the defensible space surrounding your home and adjacent outbuildings?” A majority of the respondents, 62% indicated a desire to participate in this type of training.

Homeowners were also asked, “Would you be interested in participating in a cost share program that would pay a portion of the costs of implementing fire risk projects on your property?” To this question, only 31% indicated a willingness to do so. It has been pointed out that some landowners may have interpreted this question and responded with the intention of indicating they would be willing to pay 100% of the costs themselves, or none of the costs themselves, relying on a 100% federal, state, or grant payment to make the treatments happen. Because this vastly differing interpretation of the same question, further elucidation of this response should not be made.

2.2.3 Committee Meetings

The following list of people who participated in the planning committee meetings, volunteered time, or responded to elements of the Elmore County Wildland-Urban Interface Wildfire Mitigation Plan’s preparation.

First Name	Last Name	Representing	City	State	Postal Code
Nick	Shilz	Elmore County Disaster Services	Mountain Home	Idaho	83647
Kole	Berriochoa	USFS - Mountain Home Ranger District	Mountain Home	Idaho	83647
Evans	Kuo	USFS	Boise	Idaho	83705
Calvin	Ireland	Elmore County Commissioner	Mountain Home	Idaho	83647
Larry	Rose	Elmore County Commissioner	Glenns Ferry	Idaho	83623
Mary	Equisquiza-Stanek	Elmore County Commissioner	Mountain Home	Idaho	83647
Dan	Hennis	Oasis FD	Oasis	Idaho	83647
Mark	Moore	Mountain Home Fire Department	Mountain Home	Idaho	83647
Rick	VanMeer	Mountain Home Fire Department	Mountain Home	Idaho	83647
Bud	Corbus	Mountain Home Fire Department	Mountain Home	Idaho	83647
Phil	Gridley	Mountain Home Fire Department	Mountain Home	Idaho	83647
Cathy & Charlie	Starbuck	Grand View Fire Department	Grandview	Idaho	83624
Ed	Walter	El-Wyhee Hi-Lites Newspaper	Mountain Home	Idaho	83647
Ken	Homik	Northwest Management	Moscow	Idaho	83843
Jolene	Hobdey	Oasis Fire Department	Oasis	Idaho	83647
Joe	Twitchell	RC&D Council President	Mountain Home	Idaho	83647
Candy	Rossman	SCA Fire Education Cord.	Owyhee	Nevada	89832
Kristin	Sprinke	SCA Fire Education Cord.	Owyhee	Nevada	89832
Devin	Healy	SCA Fire Education Cord.	Owyhee	Nevada	89832
Bill	Moore	NRCS RC&D Coordinator	Meridian	Idaho	83642
Jonathan	Perry	State of Idaho, BDS Manager	Boise	Idaho	83702
Pat	Lucas	State of Idaho, BDS Manager	Boise	Idaho	83702
Wayne	Forrey	Pathway Planners Consulting	Boise	Idaho	83709
William	Schlosser	Northwest Management, Inc.	Moscow	Idaho	83843

Committee Meetings were scheduled and held on the following dates:

- April 22, 2003
- May 20, 2003
- June 24, 2003
- July 29, 2003 and
- August 26, 2003

The following provides a summary of the committee meetings through reproductions of the agenda and copies of the meeting minutes.

July 24-28, 2003

An article was placed in the two local newspapers explaining the up coming plan. It identified the rationale, objectives, process and invited the public to participate in future meetings. Specific names and contact information were provided for the public to contact for more information.

July 29, 2003

- Meetings with Wildland and Rural Fire District personnel continued through the last month to verify and augment the information provided in the County Survey. This information will be used in the preparation of the Resources and Capabilities Guide and to identify possible gaps in either resources or training for fire preparedness.
- Mapping of the county at 10m resolution in GIS database complete.
- Large Fire History information provided by USFS and BLM for use in developing a Fire Prone Landscape estimation. This process continues through July.
- Community assessments has progressed during July with all medium and large size communities visited, assessed, and preliminary recommendations developed. Many of the smaller communities were visited as well.
 - On July 22, Dr. Schlosser and Mr. Scott visited Atlanta ahead of the Hot Creek Fire. The assessment of the community was completed. The two were able to take some amazing pictures of the advancing fire before access was cut off on that day. This event underscores the importance of the Fire Mitigation Plan in Elmore County as a means to increase the potential that these communities will be preserved during a large fire event.
- The community survey was drafted by NMI and edited by Wayne Forrey. Those wishing to receive an advance copy should provide e-mail address at this meeting (to Ken Homik). The letters will be e-mailed to those wishing to provide comment or just be kept up to speed on what is in it. The mailing list information was provided late in July and will be used to create the mailing list for launch in early August.
- We need to set firm dates in August or September for the community meetings to present this data and provide an avenue for community input to the planning process. We suggest the second half of August or the First half of September for these evening public meetings.

August 26, 2003

The progress on the fire mitigation plan continues through August, 2003. Specific activities since July include:

- GIS data has been collected and summarized for Elmore County,
- Fire Prone Landscapes have been estimated and have gone through field review internally. Sample maps are available to review at this meeting. Copies for Elmore County Commissioners, USFS, BLM, and one map to remain at Mtn. Home Rural Fire Department for others to review.
- Field visits by NMI fire personnel have been conducted with community evaluations completed in and around the county. Atlanta was evaluated during the early days of the Hot Creek Fire (see photos) and has since received some treatments in advance of a potential fire event in the community. Atlanta needs re-evaluation...
- Resources and Capabilities Data has been collected from Rural and Wildland Fire Fighting agencies. Some data still needs to be obtained, the fire season is hampering the collection of data, but it will be forth coming,
- Public survey was sent to 206 residents of Elmore County on August 7. Post Card reminder was sent on August 20. The final mailing will go out on about August 28.
- Fire Mitigation Projects are being developed for specific areas, and for general county wide recommendations. These will be made available to committee members for review prior to the community meetings.

Items to be completed in the near-term:

- Committee members with information that should be included in the County's Fire Mitigation Plan should convey this information to William E. Schlosser as soon as possible to make sure we incorporate as much detail at this point as possible. Ideas include where risk is located, on-going mitigation projects in the county, limiting factors that would logically be incorporated into the plan (policy, planning and zoning), and other opportunities we can incorporate.
- Need to schedule public meetings for early or mid September (ASAP). Public attendance is highest when the "smoke is still in the air". Wayne Forrey to lead scheduling, advertising, and setting up the meetings. If a date has been set before the last mailings are sent out, we will include a flyer on the meeting.

2.2.4 Public Meetings

Public meetings were held during the planning process, as an integral component to the planning process. It was the desire of the planning committee, and the Elmore County Commissioners to integrate the public's input to the development of the fire mitigation plan.

Formal public meetings were scheduled on September 15, 2003, near Oasis, Idaho, on September 16, 2003, at Mountain Home, Idaho, on September 17, 2003, at Pine, Idaho, and on September 18, at Glenns Ferry, Idaho. The purpose of these meetings was to share information on the planning process with a broadly representative cross section of Elmore County landowners. Both meetings had wall maps posted in the meeting rooms with many of the analysis results summarized specifically for the risk assessments, location of structures, fire protection, and related information. The formal portion of the presentations included a PowerPoint presentation made by Project Director, Dr. William E. Schlosser. During his presentations, comments from committee members, fire chiefs, and others were encouraged in an effort to engage the audience in a discussion.

It was made clear to all in attendance that their input was welcome and encouraged, as specific treatments had not yet been decided, nor had the risk assessment been completed. Attendees

were told that they could provide oral comment during these meetings (which was recorded by the County Fire Plan Facilitator Wayne Forrey and are summarized below), they could provide written comment to the meetings, or they could request more information in person to discuss the plan. In addition, attendees were told they would have an opportunity to review the draft plan prior to its completion to further facilitate their comments and input.

The formal presentations lasted approximately 1½ hours and included many questions and comments from the audience. Following the meetings, many discussions continued with the committee members and the general public discussing specific areas, potential treatments, the risk analysis, and other topics.

Attendance at the public meetings included 8 individuals at the Stage Stop meeting, 4 in Mountain Home, 15 in Pine, and 8 at Glenns Ferry. The following are comments, questions or suggestions from the meetings:

2.2.4.1 Stage Stop Public Meeting

September 15, 2003 - Stage Stop Meeting Room - 7:00 pm

Introduction of the purpose of the Elmore County Wildfire Mitigation Project and introduction of Team Members by Wayne S. Forrey. Four team members in attendance and four citizens in attendance.

1. Opening remarks by Southwest Idaho RC&D Coordinator, Mr. Bill Moore.
2. Presentation by Dr. Schlosser of Northwest Management, Inc.
 - Dr. Schlosser reviewed his company's background, wildfire experience and countywide wildfire analysis experience.
 - Members of his company and the entire study team members were listed.
 - Dr. Schlosser listed the goals of the National Fire Mitigation Plan
 - Dr. Schlosser introduced the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), pronounced woo-eee. He described the importance it plays in the wildfire mitigation plan process.
 - Dr. Schlosser reviewed the requirements of the National Fire Plan (NFP) and the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) planning process. The Elmore Plan will comply with both FEMA and NFP.
 - He described the guiding principles of the Elmore Fire Mitigation Project.
 - Dr. Schlosser reviewed the goals of tonight's meeting as follows:
 - Share information on the study process,
 - Stimulate and accept direct public input,
 - Discuss study recommendations for wildfire mitigation.
 - Dr. Schlosser then reviewed photos of actual burns and homes at risk as examples of past fires in Elmore County.
 - He discussed five areas in the National Fire Plan as they relate to the Elmore County wildfire mitigation plan.
 - Dr. Schlosser discussed in detail the FEMA requirements. Because the Elmore County Fire Plan will be FEMA compatible, additional funding may be available to implement the study's findings and recommendations.
 - Dr. Schlosser indicated that livestock grazing is an effective wildfire mitigation tool for Elmore County. He presented several examples.
 - Dr. Schlosser discussed fire prone landscapes throughout Elmore County and the factors which increase their wildfire exposure.
 - Dr. Schlosser presented excellent detailed maps of Elmore County showing fire history from World War II to present.

- Dr. Schlosser discussed fire risk assessment at three levels:
 - Individual home defensible space.
 - Community, which is a cluster of homes and defensible spaces.
 - Wildland, which are individual ranches or dwellings in rural areas.
 - Dr. Schlosser presented definitions of the Wildland Urban Interface, (WUI). He then presented maps showing the WUI for each community area within Elmore County.
3. Dr. Schlosser then presented five recommendations for public input:
 - a. Creation of a fire district for the Pine-Featherville community areas.
 - b. Reduce the size of the Glenns Ferry Fire District boundary.
 - c. Construct a metal building to house the Oasis Fire Department.
 - d. Create a fire protection district for the Prairie Community area.
 - e. Extend the Mountain Home Rural Fire District boundary as needed to fit the Wildland Urban Interface.
 4. Dr. Schlosser then summarized the results of the countywide wildfire mitigation survey. Survey statistics were discussed and preliminary conclusions drawn from the data.
 5. Dr. Schlosser then discussed the need to create signage throughout Elmore County to identify bridges and describe weight limits on bridges for heavy fire fighting equipment.
 6. Public discussion continued throughout the presentation and there was a general consensus that the five proposals presented by Dr. Schlosser were realistic and should be adopted into the Elmore County Wildfire Mitigation Plan. Citizens also agreed that bridges need to be identified throughout the County and weight limits should be posted.
 7. Citizens were then invited to review the various maps that had been posted throughout the room by the study team. Individual discussions pursued with citizens, Dr. Schlosser and members of study team on the various data presented on the maps.
 8. The meeting ended at about 9:30 PM.

2.2.4.2 Mountain Home Public Meeting

September 16, 2003 - American Legion Hall, Mountain Home, Main Meeting Room - 7:00pm

Introduction of the purpose of the Elmore County Wildfire Mitigation Project and introduction of Team Members by Wayne S. Forrey. Two team members in attendance and two citizens in attendance.

1. Opening remarks by Wayne S. Forrey.
2. Note: The two citizens present were Mountain Home Fire Chief Mr. Phil Gridley and Ms. Chris Alzola, who is a Fire Commissioner for the Mountain Home Rural Fire District. Rather than review Dr. Schlosser's entire computer presentation, Chief Gridley and Ms. Alzola decided to ask questions and review the maps brought to the meeting by Dr. Schlosser.
3. Dr. Schlosser presented five recommendations for public input:
 - a. Creation of a fire district for the Pine-Featherville community areas.
 - b. Reduce the size of the Glenns Ferry Fire District boundary.
 - c. Construct a metal building to house the Oasis Fire Department.
 - d. Create a fire protection district for the Prairie Community area.

- e. Extend the Mountain Home Rural Fire District boundary as needed to fit the Wildland Urban Interface.
4. Dr. Schlosser then summarized the preliminary results of the countywide wildfire mitigation survey. Survey statistics were discussed and preliminary conclusions drawn from the data. Chief Gridley hand delivered a bundle of recently mailed surveys to Wayne S. Forrey. These were given to Dr. Schlosser for inclusion in the total survey tabulation.
5. The four people in attendance discussed the maps and there was a general consensus that the five proposals presented by Dr. Schlosser were realistic and should be adopted into the Elmore County Wildfire Mitigation Plan.
6. The meeting ended at about 8:00 PM.

2.2.4.3 Pine Public Meeting

September 17, 2003 - Pine Senior Citizens Center - 7:00 pm

Introduction of the purpose of the Elmore County Wildfire Mitigation Project and introduction of Team Members by Wayne S. Forrey. Two team members in attendance and thirteen (13) citizens in attendance.

1. Opening remarks by Wayne S. Forrey.
2. Computer Presentation by Dr. Schlosser of Northwest Management, Inc.
 - Dr. Schlosser reviewed his company's background, wildfire experience and countywide wildfire analysis experience.
 - Members of his company and the entire study team members were listed.
 - Dr. Schlosser listed the goals of the National Fire Mitigation Plan
 - Dr. Schlosser introduced the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), pronounced woo-eee. He described the importance it plays in the wildfire mitigation plan process.
 - Dr. Schlosser reviewed the requirements of the National Fire Plan (NFP) and the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) planning process. The Elmore Plan will comply with both FEMA and NFP.
 - He described the guiding principles of the Elmore Fire Mitigation Project.
 - Dr. Schlosser reviewed the goals of tonight's meeting as follows:
 - Share information on the study process,
 - Stimulate and accept direct public input,
 - Discuss study recommendations for wildfire mitigation.
 - Dr. Schlosser then reviewed photos of actual burns and homes at risk as examples of past fires in Elmore County.
 - He discussed five areas in the National Fire Plan as they relate to the Elmore County wildfire mitigation plan.
 - Dr. Schlosser discussed in detail the FEMA requirements. Because the Elmore County Fire Plan will be FEMA compatible, additional funding may be available to implement the study's findings and recommendations.
 - Dr. Schlosser indicated that livestock grazing is an effective wildfire mitigation tool for Elmore County. He presented several examples.
 - Dr. Schlosser discussed fire prone landscapes throughout Elmore County and the factors which increase their wildfire exposure.
 - Dr. Schlosser presented excellent detailed maps of Elmore County showing fire history from World War II to present.
 - Dr. Schlosser discussed fire risk assessment at three levels:

- Individual home defensible space.
 - Community, which is a cluster of homes and defensible spaces.
 - Wildland, which are individual ranches or dwellings in rural areas.
 - Dr. Schlosser presented definitions of the Wildland Urban Interface, (WUI). He then presented maps showing the WUI for each community area within Elmore County.
3. Dr. Schlosser then presented five recommendations for public input:
 - a. Creation of a fire district for the Pine-Featherville community areas.
 - b. Reduce the size of the Glenns Ferry Fire District boundary.
 - c. Construct a metal building to house the Oasis Fire Department.
 - d. Create a fire protection district for the Prairie Community area.
 - e. Extend the Mountain Home Rural Fire District boundary as needed to fit the Wildland Urban Interface.
 4. Dr. Schlosser then summarized the preliminary results of the countywide wildfire mitigation survey. Survey statistics were discussed and preliminary conclusions drawn from the data.
 5. Dr. Schlosser then discussed the need to create signage throughout Elmore County to identify bridges and describe weight limits on bridges for heavy fire fighting equipment.
 6. Public discussion continued throughout the presentation and there was a general consensus that the five proposals presented by Dr. Schlosser were realistic and should be adopted into the Elmore County Wildfire Mitigation Plan. Citizens also agreed that bridges need to be identified throughout the County and weight limits should be posted.
 7. Pine and Featherville area citizens then asked Mountain Home Fire Chief Phil Gridley and Assistant Fire Chief Bud Corbus to describe the steps they need to take to organize support to create a fire district in their community. Chief Gridley and Assistant Chief Corbus spent considerable time discussing options and ways to create a fire protection district for Pine and Featherville communities. The general consensus was that a potential fire station could be located near the Trinity Springs Water Offices because it is about midway between Pine and Featherville. Residents also indicated they would like to invite the Oasis Fire Department staff to make a presentation to Pine and Featherville residents about how to organize a new fire district. The idea of a Pine-Featherville fire district was considered by most people in attendance to be a good idea, however, it was generally felt that its implementation would be difficult if implemented as a volunteer district because of the "retirement" nature of the community.
 8. Citizens were then invited to review the various maps that had been posted throughout the room by the study team. Individual discussions pursued with citizens, Dr. Schlosser and members of study team on the various data presented on the maps.
 9. The meeting ended at about 9:40 PM.

2.2.4.4 Glenns Ferry Public Meeting

September 18, 2003 - Glenns Ferry Senior Citizens Center - 7:00 pm

Introduction of the purpose of the Elmore County Wildfire Mitigation Project and introduction of Team Members by Wayne S. Forrey. Two team members in attendance and six (6) citizens in attendance.

1. Opening remarks by Wayne S. Forrey.
2. Computer Presentation by Dr. Schlosser of Northwest Management, Inc.
 - Dr. Schlosser reviewed his company's background, wildfire experience and countywide wildfire analysis experience.
 - Members of his company and study team members were listed.
 - Dr. Schlosser listed the goals of the National Fire Mitigation Plan

- Dr. Schlosser introduced the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), pronounced woo-eee. He described the importance it plays in the wildfire mitigation plan process.
 - Dr. Schlosser reviewed the requirements of the National Fire Plan (NFP) and the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) planning process. The Elmore Plan will comply with both FEMA and NFP.
 - He described the guiding principles of the Elmore Fire Mitigation Project.
 - Dr. Schlosser reviewed the goals of tonight's meeting as follows:
 - Share information on the study process,
 - Stimulate and accept direct public input,
 - Discuss study recommendations for wildfire mitigation.
 - Dr. Schlosser then reviewed photos of actual burns and homes at risk as examples of past fires in Elmore County.
 - He discussed five areas in the National Fire Plan as they relate to the Elmore County wildfire mitigation plan.
 - Dr. Schlosser discussed in detail the FEMA requirements. Because the Elmore County Fire Plan will be FEMA compatible, additional funding may be available to implement the study's findings and recommendations.
 - Dr. Schlosser indicated that livestock grazing is an effective wildfire mitigation tool for Elmore County. He presented several examples.
 - Dr. Schlosser discussed fire prone landscapes throughout Elmore County and the factors which increase their wildfire exposure.
 - Dr. Schlosser presented excellent detailed maps of Elmore County showing fire history from World War II to present.
 - Dr. Schlosser discussed fire risk assessment at three levels:
 - Individual home defensible space.
 - Community, which is a cluster of homes and defensible spaces.
 - Wildland, which are individual ranches or dwellings in rural areas.
 - Dr. Schlosser presented definitions of the Wildland Urban Interface, (WUI). He then presented maps showing the WUI for each community area within Elmore County.
3. Dr. Schlosser then presented five recommendations for public input:
 - a. Creation of a fire district for the Pine-Featherville community areas.
 - b. Reduce the size of the Glens Ferry Fire District boundary.
 - c. Construct a metal building to house the Oasis Fire Department.
 - d. Create a fire protection district for the Prairie Community area.
 - e. Extend the Mountain Home Rural Fire District boundary as needed to fit the Wildland Urban Interface.
 4. Dr. Schlosser then summarized the preliminary results of the countywide wildfire mitigation survey. Survey statistics were discussed and preliminary conclusions drawn from the data.
 5. Dr. Schlosser then discussed the need to create signage throughout Elmore County to identify bridges and describe weight limits on bridges for heavy fire fighting equipment.
 6. Public discussion continued throughout the presentation and there was a general consensus that the five proposals presented by Dr. Schlosser were realistic and should be adopted into the Elmore County Wildfire Mitigation Plan. Citizens also agreed that bridges need to be identified throughout the County and weight limits should be posted.
 7. Glens Ferry area citizens then asked Dr. Schlosser about the possibility of allowing cattle ranchers access to the land along I-84 for fire prevention by grazing. Dr. Schlosser agreed to include this recommendation in the Elmore County Fire Mitigation Plan. Discussion pursued on the need to get the Cattlemen's Association involved in this opportunity. Dr. Schlosser and Glens Ferry residents spent considerable time discussing options and ways to create a 1/4-mile wide fire protection corridor along each side of I-84 by using cattle grazing as a fire management tool. The general consensus was that fences could be built

along the I-84 corridor to allow spring cattle grazing. Another point discussed was the need to locate a fire substation in Hammett and another in King Hill for forward advance fire fighting capability. Residents also indicated they would like to see the BLM do a better job of preventing wildfire spreading onto private lands.

8. Citizens were then invited to review the various maps that had been posted throughout the room by the study team. Individual discussions pursued with citizens, Dr. Schlosser and members of study team on the various data presented on the maps.
9. The meeting ended at about 9:30 PM.

2.2.4.4.1 Meeting Notices

Public notices of this meeting were printed in the Mountain Home News and Glens Ferry Gazette Newspapers the weeks of September 1 and 7, 2003.

NEWS RELEASE

PUBLIC MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT

ELMORE COUNTY FIRE MITIGATION PLAN

Four public meetings are scheduled to discuss the Elmore County Wildland Fire Plan on:

Monday, September 15, 2003; 7:00 p.m.; Stage Stop,

Tuesday, September 16, 2003; 7:00 p.m.; Mountain Home American Legion Hall

Wednesday, September 17, 2003; 7:00 p.m.; Pine Senior Citizen Center

Thursday, September 18, 2003; 7:00 p.m.; Glenns Ferry Senior Citizens Center

The Elmore County Fire Mitigation Plan will include risk analysis at the community level with predictive models for where fires are likely to ignite and where they are likely to spread once ignited. A coordinating team including rural and wildland fire districts, land managers, elected officials, and others, in conjunction with Northwest Management specialists have been analyzing fire-prone landscapes and will be making recommendations for potential treatments. These public meetings are an opportunity to review information gathered thus far and solicit further information to incorporate into the Elmore County Fire Plan.

If you have any questions you can call the local coordinator, Wayne S. Forrey, at 362-9345 for further information.

2.2.4.4.2 Legal Notice in Local Newsprint

Memorandum To: Mountain Home Newspaper Staff

From: Wayne S. Forrey (362-9345)

Regarding: Legal Notices

Date: February 23, 2004

Please publish the following legal notice in the March 2, 2004 and March 16, 2004 editions of the Glenns Ferry Gazette Newspaper plus the March 3, 2004 and March 17, 2004 editions of the Mountain Home Newspaper, legal notice section.

Legal Notice

Draft Elmore County Wildfire Mitigation Plan

Public Review and Comment

The Elmore County Commissioners are seeking public review, comments and input on the Draft

Wildland Fire Mitigation Plan documents that have been prepared for Elmore County. Copies of these documents can be reviewed during normal business hours at the Mountain Home Public Library, the Glenns Ferry Public Library and also at the Pine/Featherville Senior Citizens Center in Pine, Idaho.

The public review and comment period for the Draft Elmore County Wildland Fire Mitigation Plan documents will be from March 3, 2004 through April 7, 2004. Please send your written comments regarding the Draft Elmore County Wildfire Mitigation Plan to the Elmore County Commissioners, County Courthouse, 150 S. 4th East Street, Mountain Home, Idaho 83647.

If you have questions, you can also contact Wayne S. Forrey, Elmore County Wildfire Coordinator at 208-362-9345.

2.3 Review of the WUI Wildfire Mitigation Plan

Review of sections of this document were conducted by the planning committee during the planning process as maps, summaries, and written assessments were completed. These individuals included fire mitigation specialists, fire fighters, planners, elected officials, and others involved in the coordination process. Preliminary findings were discussed at the public meetings, where comments were collected and facilitated.

The results of these formal and informal reviews were integrated into a DRAFT Wildland-Urban Interface Wildfire Mitigation Plan. This plan was given to members of the planning committee (including the Elmore County Commissioners, and the Southwestern Idaho RC&D) on February 17, 2004. Review of the document by the individuals involved in the planning process was made from this date until March 2, 2004.

Public review of the main document and the appendices was held from March 3 through April 7, 2004. Comments were integrated into the final document. Actual comments were accepted until final publication date on May 7, 2004. The general public, agencies, rural fire districts, the Southwestern Idaho RC&D, and the Elmore County Commissioners all provided meaningful and substantive comments to the final plan and are incorporated herein.

The final version of the plan is dated May 10, 2004; both the "Main Document" and the "Appendices" show this date on the front cover.